

Appl. No.: 10/658,446  
TC/A.U.: 3711 Docket No.: B03-58  
Reply to Office Action of April 2, 2004

### REMARKS

Claims 1 and 7-10 and 13-18 appear in this application for the Examiner's review and consideration.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the elements of claim 4 and 2 such that claim 1 is now claim 4 rewritten in independent form with the element from claim 2. Claim 10 has been amended to add limitations directed to compression and specific gravity. Support for the amended elements is found in the Specification at least on page 9, lines 19-26. Claim 10 also includes a limitation to the standard diameter of the ball as set forth on page 6, line 5 and the limitations of claims 11 and 12.

The Examiner has acknowledged that claim 4 is directed to allowable subject matter. Claim 4 has been re-written in independent form as stated above.

### Rejections Over U.S. Patent No. 5,935,022 and 5,932,661

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Nos. 5,935,022 and 5,932,661. Claim 1 has been amended to be claim 4 in independent form and 2-6 cancelled. For at least these reasons, these rejections have been overcome.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7, 10-12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,952,415. Regarding claims 1-3 and 5-7, claim 1 has been rewritten as claim 4, claims 2-3 and 5-6 have been deleted and claim 7 depends from claim 1. Thus, these rejections are believed to have been overcome.

Regarding claims 10-12 and 14-16, the applicant first disagrees with the Examiner's characterization that the '415 patent teaches highly neutralized polymers. The paragraphs in the '415 patent identified by the Examiner teach ionomers and that different metals can be used. However, the '415 patent does not suggest highly neutralized polymers. Moreover, the reference teaches balls having compressions from 87 to 107. Thus, the balls have relatively high compressions and this does not suggest in any way a core having a compression in the range of 10-60 as set forth in these claims. Thus, these rejections are believed to have been overcome.

Claims 1, 2, 5-11 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,705,956. Regarding claims 1, 2, and 5-7, claim 1 has been amended to be claim

Appl. No.: 10/658,446  
TC/A.U.: 3711 Docket No.: B03-58  
Reply to Office Action of April 2, 2004

4, claims 2 and 5-6 have been deleted, and claim 7 depends from claim 1. Thus, these rejections are believed to be overcome.

Regarding claims 10-11 and 14-18, the '956 patent does not suggest highly neutralized polymers as set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action on page 6. The Applicant also points out that the '965 patent does not suggest a core having a specific gravity of less than 1.05. The '956 patent states that the core specific gravity should be between 1.1 and 1.4. Col. 4, line 30. Finally, the patent teaches that the reactive co-agent should be present in an amount of 10-35 parts. Thus, this rejection is also believed to have been overcome.

**Rejection Over U.S. Patent No. 6,705,956 In View of U.S. Patent No. 5,971,872**

Claims 10, 11 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,705,956 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,971,872. The applicant reiterates that the '956 patent does not teach a highly neutralized polymer, that the specific gravity of the core is higher than claimed and that the reactive co-agent is substantially higher. The '872 patent does not fix these deficiencies. First of all, the applicant disagrees that the '872 patent teaches highly neutralized polymers. The patent teaches general high acid ionomers and states that they are at least partially neutralized. This does not suggest that they are highly neutralized. Second, the core specific gravities are not less than 1.05. The cores set forth in the table in Col. 20 have specific gravities in the range of 1.07 to 1.17, with the 1.07 specific gravity being for an oversized ball. Thus, there is no suggestion to lower the specific gravity for a golf ball having a diameter of 1.68 inches. Finally, the amount of reactive co-agent suggested is 15-25 parts. Col. 9, line 60.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is believed to have been overcome for at least the above reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

Appl. No.: 10/658,446  
TC/A.U.: 3711 Docket No.: B03-58  
Reply to Office Action of April 2, 2004


### Conclusion

Based on the remarks set forth above, Applicants believe that all of the rejections have been overcome and the claims of the subject application are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any further concerns or believe that a discussion with the Applicants' agent/attorney would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the agent/attorney at the number below.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission. However, should any required fees be due, please charge them to Acushnet Company Deposit Account No. 502309.

Respectfully submitted,

7-2-04  
Date

  
Troy R. Lester (Reg. No. 36,200)  
(508) 979-3534

Customer Number: 040990